

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-12, 17-18, and 21-24 are pending in the present application. In this amendment, Applicants have added claims 21-24 and amended claims 1-2 and 11-12. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-2 and 11-12, prior to this Amendment, is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-2 and 11-12 were amended in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-2 and 11-12, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-12, 17-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 1-2 and 11-12. Applicants believe these amendments overcome this rejection. Therefore, Applicants believe this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 7-8, 10-12, 17-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0212884), hereinafter “*Lee*”. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, in part: “a single hardware channel adapter that is included in a System Area Network (SAN)”. *Lee* does not teach or suggest this feature.

Lee states that data processing system 100 may be implemented as a server in a network. *Lee* also teaches each PCI I/O adapter 120-121 providing an interface between data processing system 100 and input/output devices such as other network computers. *Lee* teaches merely a network, not a System Area Network. Therefore, *Lee* does not anticipate Applicants’ claims.

Applicants' claim 1 recites, in part: "wherein the hardware channel adapter is included in a node that includes a central processing unit, and wherein the hardware channel adapter couples the central processing unit to a switch". *Lee* does not teach or suggest these features.

Lee teaches a processor that is coupled to a network using a PCI I/O adapter. *Lee* does not teach or suggest the PCI I/O adapter coupling the processor to a switch. Thus, the PCI I/O adapter is not analogous to the hardware channel adapter claimed by Applicants. Therefore, *Lee* does not anticipate Applicants' claims.

The PCI I/O adapter is also not analogous to the hardware channel adapter claimed by Applicants because the PCI I/O adapter does not include a partition ID. Therefore, *Lee* does not anticipate Applicants' claims.

Claim 1 also recites, in part: "a plurality of resources that are included in a single hardware channel adapter" and "storing, by a hypervisor, a first partition identifier that identifies the first partition in a first hardware register that is included within the at least the first one of the plurality of resources". Thus, the first partition identifier is stored in the first one of the plurality of resources, and these resources are resources that are included in the hardware channel adapter. As noted above, the hardware channel adapter is included in a node that includes a central processing unit, and wherein the hardware channel adapter couples the central processing unit to a switch.

The processor taught by *Lee* is not a "resource" as is claimed by Applicants. The resource claimed by Applicants is included in a hardware channel adapter. The processor taught by *Lee* is not a resource as claimed by Applicants because the processor is not included in a hardware channel adapter. The hardware channel adapter claimed by Applicants couples the central processing unit to a switch. The processor taught by *Lee* does not couple a central processing unit to a switch. Therefore, *Lee* does not anticipate Applicants' claims.

The processor taught by *Lee* has a partition ID in the processor's hardware. The partition ID taught by *Lee*, however, is not analogous to the partition identifier claimed by Applicants because the partition ID taught by *Lee* is not stored in a hardware register of a resource that is included within a hardware channel adapter that couples a central processing unit to a switch. That is, the partition ID taught by *Lee* is included in the processor itself, not in an adapter that couples the processor to a switch. Because the partition ID taught by *Lee* is not included in a

resource that is included in a hardware channel adapter, *Lee* does not anticipate Applicants' claims.

Applicants' claim 11 has been amended to recite features that are similar to the features of claim 1. Therefore, the discussion above is equally applied to claim 11.

Applicants have added claim 21 which recites: "wherein the hardware channel adapter is included in a fabric". *Lee* does not anticipate this claim because *Lee* does not teach or suggest a fabric. Applicants have added claim 23. Since claim 23 recites features that are similar to the features of claim 21, claim 23 is patentable for the reason given above.

Applicants have added claim 22 which recites: "wherein the System Area Network (SAN) is an InfiniBand (IB) network". *Lee* does not anticipate this claim because *Lee* does not teach or suggest an InfiniBand network. Applicants have added claim 24. Since claim 24 recites features that are similar to the features of claim 22, claim 24 is patentable for the reason given above.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are patentable for the reasons given above.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: July 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants